

# Exhibit 1



JASON LO, SBN 219030  
jlo@gibsondunn.com  
BROOKE WALLACE, SBN 259169  
bwallace@gibsondunn.com  
CAROLINE MONROY, SBN 329018  
cmonroy@gibsondunn.com  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197  
Telephone: 213.229.7000  
Facsimile: 213.229.7520

Attorneys for Plaintiff Netlist Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NETLIST INC., a Delaware  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO.,  
LTD., a Korean corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 8:20-cv-993-JAK (DFMx)

**REDACTED FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF  
CONTRACT AND DECLARATORY  
RELIEF**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**FILED UNDER SEAL PURSUANT  
TO ORDER OF COURT DATED  
AUGUST 12, 2020**

1 Plaintiff Netlist Inc. (“Netlist”) complains and alleges the following against  
2 Defendant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Samsung”):

3 **THE PARTIES**

4 1. Netlist is a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business at  
5 175 Technology Drive, Suite 150, Irvine, CA 92618.

6 2. Samsung is a Korean corporation with its principal offices at 129  
7 Samsung-Ro, Yeontong-gu, Suwon-si, Gyeonggi-do, South Korea. Samsung  
8 manufactures and sells a wide range of products, including semiconductors, memory  
9 components, and memory modules, in the United States.

10 **JURISDICTION**

11 3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)  
12 because the amount in controversy exceeds seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000)  
13 exclusive of interest and costs, and there is complete diversity of citizenship because  
14 Defendant Samsung is a citizen of South Korea and Plaintiff Netlist is a citizen of  
15 California.

16 4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Samsung because Samsung  
17 transacted and continues to transact business in this District and its actions caused and  
18 continue to cause injury to Netlist within this District.

19 5. This Court has the power to grant declaratory relief under the Declaratory  
20 Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202. An actual controversy exists between the  
21 Parties within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a), which is of sufficient immediacy  
22 and reality to warrant declaratory relief.

23 **VENUE**

24 6. Venue is proper within this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c).  
25 Samsung transacts business and contracted to sell its products to Netlist within this  
26 District. Venue also is proper because Netlist’s principal place of business is in this  
27 District, and Netlist suffered harm in this District. Finally, a substantial part of the  
28 events giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.

**BACKGROUND**

7. Netlist is a leading provider of high-performance modular memory subsystems to original equipment manufacturers, and specializes in hybrid memory that merges DRAM and NAND flash raw materials to create efficient memory solutions.

8. Samsung is South Korea's largest company and one of the world's largest producers of semiconductors. Among other things, Samsung develops, manufactures, and sells memory components and memory modules.

9. On November 12, 2015, Netlist and Samsung entered into a Joint Development and License Agreement (the "Agreement"). Netlist and Samsung entered into the Agreement [REDACTED]

**Supply Terms**

10. As part of the consideration of the Agreement, Netlist sought to ensure that it would have a dependable and stable supply of [REDACTED]

11. In the year prior to entering the Agreement, Samsung [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to Netlist. After signing the Agreement, Netlist and Samsung increased their transactions. At first, Samsung supplied [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and Netlist purchased these products regularly. During the first two years, Samsung sold Netlist [REDACTED] [REDACTED] each quarter. In 2016, Netlist purchased approximately [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from Samsung. In 2017, Netlist's purchases [REDACTED]

1           12. However in 2018, Samsung began not to fulfill Netlist's requests or  
2 orders. Samsung deliberately began to restrict Netlist's access to products and failed  
3 to fulfill its orders, often without notice and always in violation of the Agreement. For  
4 example, in the first quarter of 2018, Samsung supplied Netlist with only [REDACTED]  
5 [REDACTED]—despite Netlist's request for substantially higher volumes—which  
6 is less than [REDACTED] supplied in the same quarter of the previous year.

7           13. Samsung continues to restrict the supply of [REDACTED]  
8 to Netlist.

9           14. By repeatedly breaching the Agreement, Samsung forced Netlist to forgo  
10 business opportunities and [REDACTED]  
11 [REDACTED] Netlist was unable to obtain many products that Samsung  
12 provided and was required to supply under the Agreement. When Samsung failed to  
13 fulfill Netlist's orders, Netlist could not supply its customers and lost business  
14 opportunities and profits it otherwise would have earned had Samsung performed. In  
15 addition, Netlist [REDACTED]  
16 [REDACTED]

17           **Joint Development Fees**

18           15. In addition, Section 3.1 of the Agreement provides that Samsung [REDACTED]  
19 [REDACTED]  
20 [REDACTED]  
21 Section 3.2 of the Agreement permits Samsung to withhold taxes due or payable to the  
22 Korean tax authority [REDACTED]  
23 [REDACTED]  
24 [REDACTED]

25           16. Shortly after entering the Agreement, Samsung withheld [REDACTED]  
26 [REDACTED] owed to Netlist under Section 3.1. Samsung claims it paid this  
27 withholding to the Korean tax authority, even though, on information and belief, [REDACTED]  
28 [REDACTED] This was a surprise to

1 Netlist, which had understood that the amount would not be taxed in Korea under the  
2 applicable law.

3 17. Netlist has sought and continues to seek its lawful refund from the Korean  
4 tax authorities for the amount over-withheld and has repeatedly requested that  
5 Samsung cooperate in claiming a credit, refund, or exemption for this amount.  
6 Samsung has instead responded that it properly withheld taxes, has delayed or declined  
7 to provide the cooperation requested, and has not been forthcoming to Netlist  
8 regarding what it has done or could do to help.

9 18. Samsung has breached the Agreement by wrongfully withholding [REDACTED]  
10 [REDACTED] owed to Netlist, and by failing to cooperate with Netlist as the latter  
11 continues to seek to recover the amount withheld.

12 **Termination**

13 19. On May 27, 2020, Netlist notified Samsung that Netlist was exercising its  
14 rights under Section 13.2 of the Agreement. That section provides that a party may  
15 terminate the Agreement if the other [REDACTED]  
16 [REDACTED]  
17 [REDACTED]  
18 [REDACTED]

19 20. Samsung's breaches preclude a material purpose of the Agreement from  
20 being achieved—namely, Netlist's contractual right to [REDACTED]  
21 [REDACTED]

22 21. Samsung did not cure its breach within thirty days of receiving notice.

23 22. On July 15, 2020, Netlist issued written notice to Samsung terminating  
24 the Agreement under Section 13.2.

25 23. Upon a termination pursuant to Section 13.2 of the Agreement, all  
26 [REDACTED]  
27 [REDACTED] [i.e., July 20, 2020].

28 Moreover, [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]  
2 [REDACTED]  
3 [REDACTED]  
4 24. Samsung has not responded to Netlist's attempts to notify the company of  
5 its breaches and its decision to terminate the Agreement. Samsung has not complied  
6 with its obligations upon termination.

7 **COUNT ONE**

8 **(Breach of Contract)**

9 25. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate each preceding and succeeding paragraph as  
10 relevant and as though fully set forth herein.

11 26. As alleged above, Samsung entered into an Agreement with Netlist that  
12 required Samsung to supply [REDACTED]  
13 [REDACTED]

14 27. Samsung breached the Agreement by failing to [REDACTED]  
15 [REDACTED] These breaches occurred repeatedly, beginning in June 2017, and  
16 continue to this day.

17 28. Netlist has performed all material obligations owed to Samsung under the  
18 Agreement.

19 29. As a direct and proximate result of Samsung's breach of the Agreement,  
20 Netlist has suffered damages.

21 **COUNT TWO**

22 **(Breach of Contract)**

23 30. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each preceding and succeeding paragraph as  
24 relevant and as though fully set forth herein.

25 31. As alleged above, Samsung entered into an Agreement with Netlist that  
26 required Samsung to pay Netlist [REDACTED]  
27 [REDACTED]  
28 [REDACTED]

32. Samsung breached the Agreement by wrongfully [REDACTED] [REDACTED] owed to Netlist as consideration for its development costs and by failing to reasonably cooperate with Netlist as it the latter continues to seek its refund from the Korean tax authorities for the amount over-withheld.

33. Netlist has performed all material obligations owed to Samsung under the Agreement.

34. As a direct and proximate result of Samsung's breach of the Agreement, Netlist has suffered damages at least in the amount of [REDACTED] all applicable prejudgment and post-judgment interest, and such further and other relief as this Court shall deem just and proper.

### **COUNT THREE**

#### **(Declaratory Relief: Termination of Contract)**

35. Plaintiff hereby incorporates each preceding and succeeding paragraph as relevant and as though fully set forth herein.

36. Samsung repeatedly breached the Agreement and its breaches preclude a material purpose of the Agreement from being achieved.

37. On May 27, 2020, Netlist sent notice of this breach to Samsung pursuant to the terms of the Agreement stating that Netlist was exercising its rights under Section 13.2 of the Agreement.

38. Samsung did not cure its breach, and on July 15, 2020, Netlist sent written notice to Samsung terminating the Agreement under Section 13.2.

39. As a result of termination, all licenses and other rights previously granted to Samsung ceased on July 20, 2020. Samsung has not acknowledged Netlist's termination nor has it complied with its obligations upon termination.

40. As a result of the facts described in the foregoing paragraphs, an actual controversy of sufficient immediacy exists between the Parties, and a determination of rights under the Agreement is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).



41. Accordingly, Netlist seeks a determination that it has terminated the Agreement under Section 13.2, and all license and other rights granted to Samsung under the Agreement have ceased as of July 20, 2020.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests:

- (a) An award of damages to Netlist in an amount to be determined at trial;
- (b) A declaratory judgment that Netlist has terminated the Agreement pursuant to Section 13.2 and that Samsung's licenses and rights under the Agreement have ceased;
- (c) Prejudgment and post-judgment interest;
- (d) Any such other, further, and general relief as is just and proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Netlist hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues raised by the First Amended Complaint under Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Dated: August 31, 2020

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

By: /s/ Jason Lo  
Jason Lo

Attorney for Netlist Inc.